Alternative derivation of the response of interferometric gravitational wave detectors

Neil J. Cornish
Department of Physics, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59717

It has recently been pointed out by Finn that the long-standing derivation of the response of an interferometric gravitational wave detector contains several errors. Here I point out that a contemporaneous derivation of the gravitational wave response for spacecraft doppler tracking and pulsar timing avoids these pitfalls, and when adapted to describe interferometers, recovers a simplified version of Finn's derivation. This simplified derivation may be useful for pedagogical purposes.

arXiv:0910.4372v1 [gr-qc] 22 Oct 2009

Finn [1] has shown that the standard derivation [2, 3], of the the response of an interferometric gravitational wave detector is based on several unjustified assumptions. These errors propagated undetected through the literature for over 35 years. The main problem with the standard derivation is that it neglects the lensing of the photon path by the the gravitational waves. The errors are easy to miss when working in the transverse-traceless gauge, where the tying of the coordinates to free test particles has the effect of absorbing the wave motion into the coordinate system. Luckily, fortuitous cancellations in the transverse-traceless gauge lead to the correct final result, so that the response formalism developed for gravitational wave detectors such as LIGO [4] and LISA [5, 6] are unaffected.

The purpose of this comment is to point out that not all of the original derivations of the gravitational wave response are flawed, and that as early as 1975 Estabrook and Wahlquist [7] published a derivation that is equivalent to Finn's when applied to interferometric detectors. Their derivation considered gravitational wave detection by spacecraft doppler tracking, but it has since been generalized to describe the gravitational wave response of pulsar timing arrays [8] and the fractional frequency shifts measured by the LISA observatory (see Ref. [9] and the appendix of Ref. [6]).

Estabrook and Wahlquist start by considering a weak gravitational wave propagating in the z direction, which in the transverse-traceless gauge is described by the line element (in units where the speed of light $c = 1$)

$$ds^2 = -dudv + (1+h_{xx})dx^2 + (1+h_{yy})dy^2 + 2h_{xy}dxdy\,. \tag{1}$$

Here $h_{ij}(u)$, $h_{yy} = -h_{xx}$, $u = t - z$ and $v = t + z$. They recognized that the metric is independent of the coordinates x, y, v, so there exist three Killing vectors $\vec{\partial}_x$, $\vec{\partial}_y$, $\vec{\partial}_v$. The doppler shifts caused by the gravitational wave follow immediately from the constancy of the photon momentum one-form components p_x, p_y, p_v and the null condition $p_\mu p^\mu = 0$.

This elegant derivation can easily be generalized to describe the response of a laser interferometer. In the transverse traceless gauge the coordinate acceleration vanishes, so free test particles stay fixed at the same spatial coordinates, and the coordinate time t corresponds to the proper time τ along the world-line of a test particle. As shown in Figure 1 of Ref. [1], we need to compute the difference in light travel times along the two arms of the interferometer. The outward and return journeys along each arm can all be computed in the same way, so we only need consider a single pass, which, without loss of generality, can be taken as the null geodesic connecting the events $\vec{x}_1 \to (0,0,0,0)$ and $\vec{x}_2 \to (t,x,y,z)$. The null condition and the three Killing vectors yield four equations for the components of photon's 4-velocity $s^\mu = dx^\mu/d\lambda$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&-s^u s^v + (1+h_{xx})(s^x)^2 + (1+h_{yy})(s^y)^2 + 2h_{xy}s^x s^y = 0\\
&(1+h_{xx})s^x + h_{xy}s^y = \alpha_1\\
&(1+h_{yy})s^y + h_{xy}s^x = \alpha_2\\
&s^u = -2\alpha_3\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here the α_i are constants of integration that determine the photon path. Using the α_1 and α_2 equations, the null condition can be re-written:

$$2\alpha_3 s^v + \alpha_1 s^x + \alpha_2 s^y = 0\,. \tag{3}$$

Since we are interested in describing weak gravitational waves ($h \ll 1$), it is permissible to solve these equations perturbatively such that $x^\mu(\lambda) = x_0^\mu(\lambda) + \delta x^\mu(\lambda)$ and $\alpha_i = \alpha_i^0 + \delta\alpha_i$, where the zeroth order solution pertains when $h = 0$. Simple algebra yields

$$\alpha_1^0 = \frac{x}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}, \quad \alpha_2^0 = \frac{y}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}, \quad \alpha_3^0 = -\frac{L-z}{2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)}, \tag{4}$$

and $t_0 = \sqrt{x^2+y^2+z^2} \equiv L$. As stressed by Finn [1], the photon path is lensed by the gravitational wave, and it is necessary to adjust ones "aim" (i.e. the α_i) when $h \neq 0$. Using the fact that the coordinate location of the test particles is unaffected by the gravitational wave, we have $\delta x^i(\lambda_1) = \delta x^i(\lambda_2) = 0$, and expanding (2) to first order yields:

$$\delta\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{(L-z)(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\left(xH_{xx} + yH_{xy}\right), \tag{5}$$

$$\delta\alpha_2 = \frac{1}{(L-z)(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}\left(yH_{yy} + xH_{xy}\right), \tag{6}$$

$$\delta\alpha_3 = -\frac{\delta t}{2(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}, \tag{7}$$

where $H_{ij} = \int_{u_1}^{u_2} h_{ij}(u)\,du$ and

$$\delta t = \frac{1}{2L(L-z)}\left(x^2H_{xx} + y^2H_{yy} + 2xyH_{xy}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\frac{\hat{x}\otimes\hat{x} : \mathbf{H}}{1-\hat{k}\cdot\hat{x}} \,. \tag{8}$$

In the final expression for the time delay imparted by the gravitational wave, δt, I have written the result in the usual coordinate independent form for a gravitational wave propagating in the $\hat{k}$ direction [5].

The derivation given above is equivalent to Finn's, the difference being that Finn started with the second order differential equations for $x^\mu(\lambda)$ that follow from the geodesic equation, while I started with the first integrals of the geodesic equation that follow from the presence of the three Killing vectors. Writers of textbooks and review articles should pay attention to Finn's article and avoid propagating the erroneous derivation of the interferometer response function any further, and they may also want to consider presenting the simpler "Estabrook and Wahlquist style" derivation outlined above.

[1] L. S. Finn, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 022002 (2009)

[2] R. Weiss, Tech. Rep. LIGO-P720002-01-R, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, (1972), available at www.ligo.caltech.edu/docs/P/P720002-00.pdf

[3] R. L. Forward, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 379 (1978).

[4] P. R. Saulson, *Fundamentals of interferometric gravitational wave detectors*, (World Scientific Publishers, Singapore, 1994).

[5] N. J. Cornish and L. J. Rubbo, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 022001 (2003)

[6] L. J. Rubbo, N. J. Cornish and O. Poujade, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 082003 (2004)

[7] F. B. Estabrook and H. D. Wahlquist, Gen. Rel. Grav. **6**, 439 (1975)

[8] S. Detweiler, Astrophys. J. **234**, 1100 (1979).

[9] M. Vallisneri, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 022001 (2005)